High Density in Norman
Session 2

"Location and Compatibility"
June 28, 2012

Green Table
COMPABILITY

Scale
Style
Integration
Buffer zone/Security
Sociability
Noise
Ease of movement
Privacy
Height
Landscaping
Material
Public Space - access to
Variety
Parking
Variety of demographics
Affordable housing intergraded within high density development project

LOCATION

- On bus lines
- Near university
- South of Hwy 9
- Near available utilities
- Destruction of older neighborhoods
- Distribution between developers workability 5/10 minutes
- Corners of intersections (major)
- Downtown/main street
- North Park
- Health Plex
- No where in Norman
- Why not low density infill
- Max of 50 units
- No max cap
- Behind Lowes
- Any blighted area
- Any area E/N of urban Norman
- 24th/Robinson NE
- TIF area
- Along RR
- Far E Main – between Classen/12th
- Outside core Norman

Salmon Table
COMPABILITY

- Scale fitting with surroundings
- Complement neighborhood
- Historic significance, preservation
- Target market
- Future stability traffic can be handled by streets
- Effect on existing community/housing market
- Replacement, gentrification of dilapidated homes rather than high density not all arterial streets should have high density traffic
- Preserving small starter homes because they are affordable
- Traffic and transportation – auto, bike, foot, public

LOCATION

- None
- Moore
- ~~Near OU campus~~
- ~~East Lindsey~~
- ~~Not Campus Corner~~
- ~~Not in existing S.F. Neighborhoods~~
- ~~Downtown but not 100 u/ar~~

(NOTE: Lines are shown as indicated in the original meeting table notes)

Light Blue Table
COMPABILITY

We need to figure out what we need
Comes down to demographics
Not blocking views
Accessibility concerns.
Closest to stores, entertainment
Access to public transit
Height and density – limits based on location
Adequate parking – inc. accessibility spaces
Aesthetics
Neighborhood traffic
Mass and scale
Review ordinances from other university towns

LOCATION

Aesthetics – context – architectural detail – space

Location

Reflection of surroundings
Usability/universal design
Limited eligible areas
Campus corner
Downtown
Around university
University North Park
Access to proper utilities
One size does not fit all
Access to transit
Walkability

Yellow Table
COMPABILITY

- Accessibility.
- Where projects are located – keep "quaintness" of Norman in mind, right product in right spot. Campus area nearer taller OU buildings
- More established area to be in walking distance of amenities
- Need plan to ensure compatibility
- Remove older buildings to make way – infill
- Create environment to "hold" people in one place
- Put buildings on arterials
- Losing core area homes
- Bring more density closer to businesses
- OU has shown parking garage can look, OK, Campus Corner needs a garage
- Must address parking w/high density infill
- Change in attitude about walking/driving
- Look at Bricktown as an example (walk and pay for parking)
- Need structured parking (expensive)
- Have to go up in core area to park, there taller building to cover cost of land and parking garage
- Solution for replacing some of older complexes (cheaper than rehabbing).
- Need to offer different product
- Place where people can have a pet
- Too many apartments in Norman already?
- Move out of older complex to newer, nice one as older one gets torn down
- Limited services on Campus Corner, will people still drive? Or will trips go down?
- Need more transit services in Norman
- Transit is expensive, drain on City resources

TOP FIVE ELEMENTS OF COMPATIBILITY:

Sense of community/state in community – owner occupied property
Mixed use product
Aesthetics/designs in relation to location
Safety (lighting, design)
Accessibility

Yellow Table (cont)

What areas are appropriate for higher density?

- B/W Campus Corner and Main Street
- UNP (bring buildings closer together and eliminate all the surface lots)
- Near amenities (within walking distance)
- North of Gray Street
- Areas ripe for "renewal"
- Keep traffic concerns in minds when choosing location and public transportation

What do we hope to achieve with higher density?

- Better sense of community
- Something better than we have today
- Providing diversity in housing
- Different way/quality of life
- Less stress on infrastructure, reduction in sprawl
- Vitality of core Norman
- Moves students out of crowded single family homes
- Redevelopment of aging properties
- Better utilization of existing surface parking

Dark Blue Table
COMPABILITY

Work with existing neighborhood
Height
Density (traffic) limit
Replace older rental units with compatible units
Is high density possible? Where?
Landscaping/Streetscaping
Architecture
Scale compatibility – Buffers
Need long range plan
Consider 50+ u/ac
100 u/ac works where transit available
Appropriate location

LOCATION

High activity locations
Arterial streets
Locations with current high density
Main – Boyd, Santa Fe – BNSF
225/block/2.5 acre
Consider access to rail transit
Borders/perimeters of neighborhoods
Adjacent to industrial/institutional/existing high density
Infill
Desirability to tenants
Main/Peters
University North Park
Campus Corner

Beige Table
COMPABILITY

- Fit in with neighborhood, traffic, parking
- Doesn't stick out
- Easy to see people when outside (social area)
- Connectivity to people
- Consideration of existing neighborhood, but plan for future
- 1 parking space for apartment
- Cars per capita (a car per bed)
- Large shift in paradigm for community
- Setting expectations for current property owners
- How do you legislate? Write code for compatibility.
- Differential in height with adjacent properties
- "Fad" architecture
- Consideration of long term upkeep
- May be appropriate with certain provisions
- Architecture compatible with surroundings
- Transitional elements (how to legislate?)
- Consideration of infrastructure
- Create positive economics for neighborhood revitalization
- Incentive for opportunities in market
- Build standards in code like other communities
- Size in relation to adjacent buildings
- Walkability/livability

Top 5 Priorities:
Height differential/setbacks/restrictive light/mass
Material used in construction
Clear instructions as to what high density is
Lack of transportation and services
Livability
Walkability
Services (adequate)
Traffic/parking
Rental vs ownership in neighborhood
Compatibility within unit w/tenants
Consolidation of types of rental

(NOTE: these were all listed, could not make out a ranking system)

Beige Table (cont)
LOCATION

- Lindsey (between I-35, 24th SE)
- Campus Area
- University North Park (TIF)
- Gray (between Comanche and Railroad)
- Elm (west) Main (north) Railroad tracks (east) Boyd (south)
- Eufaula to Duffy
- Boyd (between Classen and Jenkins)
- Ed Noble Parkway

Exclusions:

- Railroad
- Classen south of Lindsey to connection at 12th Street
- North of Dillard building to Rock Creek Bridge (on Interstate Drive)

Pink Table
COMPABILITY

Different styles but work together (preserving neighborhoods)
Low noise level
Small town feel
Feeling of space
Height barrier – not a lot above 2 stores (buffer)
Places of interaction
Privacy – no windows to close
Buildings that don't prevent view – hurt structure already there
Respect with other buildings
Pedestrian need respect
Minimum intrusion
Students and resident living together – place for students, place for Norman residents.

LOCATION

Center of Norman (easy walking to church, store, medical, etc)
Allow for residents to be able to care for others (parents, friends, etc)
General in Norman – Lindsey, Main, Robinson, 12th & Alameda
Porter Corridor
Area of Norman that allows you to walk
Students – Campus – Hway 9 – Campus Corner
New Hospital (west Norman)
University town center
Central State Hospital

Not OK – Boyd center

White Table
COMPABILITY

- Drought tolerant landscaping
- Making infill work with existing single family homes, building materials, bulk
- Demographic compatibility (houses, schools – that work well together)
- Compatible with existing infrastructure
- Avoid "big box" parking
- Rather than blank walls, windows on street
- As few restrictions as possible
- Happy medium between cookie cutter and total differences in building styles
- Differences can be very interesting
- Visual compatibility between commercial and surrounding context
- Buildings as landmarks – icons
- Preserve space and sky
- Height changes neighbors perceptions of privacy
- Are tall buildings an urban intense density we want?
- Losing sunlight (sunsets, ice lingers in winter)
- Norman's identity is unique
- Could higher density housing work in University North Park?
- Mixed density use could greatly improve walkability
- Higher density could be added into existing commercial districts
- Walking is not an everyday thing in OK culture
- Higher density needs public space using the City as a "living room" nice settings make whole environment more attractive
- Visibility – preserve open space – heights - don't build too tall
- Infill existing commercial districts
- Scale
- Infill works with whole context – built/infrastructure
- Preserving individual identity compatibility thru differences

White Table (cont)
LOCATION

1. University North Park area? Not scaled for walkability
2. Lots along railroad between Main and Duffy
3. In relationship to railroad – possible future for rail travel
4. unique road between downtown and Campus Corner and OU
5. See development that supports continued revival of downtown
6. Campus Corner is mostly 1 story – missed opportunity now. Already zoned for density.
7. Norman has a lot of vitality in place already.
8. Critical mass is needed for successful businesses.
9. Walking radius in relationship to existing amenities (future amenities?)
10. Transit stops can create linkage with critical mass transit oriented development
11. Takes us back to 1940s-50s patterns
12. Infill feels more comfortable than redevelopment
13. Intersection of Classen and Lindsey